REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-21 are pending. The Office Action dated May 1, 2008 in this Application has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 20 and 21 have been amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview conducted on May 29, 2008. During the interview the above amendments and following remarks were discussed. In particular, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the Hagiwara reference as it is being applied to Claim 1. Tentative agreement was not reached that such amendments patentably distinguish from the art currently of record. However, the Examiner and Applicant's representative tentatively agreed that certain amendments to Claim 1 clarifying certain claim language could help overcome the art.

Claims 1, 6-8, 10, 12, 14, 17-18, and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,784,035 to Hagiwara et al. ("Hagiwara") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,248,229 to Zerphy et al. ("Zerphy"). In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejected independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely:

> assigning a column number associated with each display of a plurality of display devices;
> assigning a row number associated with each display of a plurality of display devices;

> generating an image to be displayed on at least two of the plurality of display devices;
> dynamically defining a plurality of image segments during a time when the image is
> rendered, wherein the segments comprise one or more portions of the image;
> generating a first and second offset for at least two of the plurality of display devices;
> selecting at least two segments of the image as a function of the first and second offset;
> and
> projecting the at least two selected segments on the at least two display devices. (Emphasis added).

Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, page 6, lines 9-31 and FIG. 1 of the Application as originally filed.

Regarding Claim 1, Hagiwara and Zerphy were cited as assertedly fully disclosing assigning a column and row number associated with each member of a plurality of display devices. However, Hagiwara does not teach assigning a column and row number associated with each ***display*** of a plurality of display devices. Here, it appears that the Examiner had interpreted the previous limitation of "member" as being an individual pixel, and not a "display", as now amended. Further, Hagiwara does not suggest, teach, or disclose ***wherein the segments comprise one or more portions of the image***. Here, Hagiwara appears to merely display a single image on a corresponding display, and not portions of the image or the segments. *See* Hagiwara, Fig. 1-3. In addition, Hagiwara does not suggest, teach, or disclose ***projecting*** the at least two selected segments on the at least two display devices.

In addition, the Examiner cited Zerphy as assertedly disclosing dynamically defining a plurality of image segments during a time when the image is rendered. Office Action, Page 4. However, Zerphy, as cited in Col. 6, line 37 to Col. 7, line 5 does not teach the individual image segments. "Display units" of Zerphy are being interpreted as image segments. The "display units"

are actually hardware entities as evidenced in the functional description "the controller sends a series of communication integrity messages to the set of display units." Zerphy, Col. 1, lines 47-50. Moreover, the dynamic defining of the "display units", as asserted by the Examiner, does not occur during a time when the image is rendered.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited references do not teach the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hagiwara and Zerphy be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 6-8, 10, 12, 14, and 17-18 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 6-8, 10, 12, 14, and 17-18 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, the cited references do not teach features such as two adjacent screens, a first and second offset, selecting at least two of the display devices, generating a video image, generating the image in a client, or synchronizing. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent Claims 6-8, 10, 12, 14, and 17-18 also be withdrawn.

Applicant contends that the rejection of amended Claims 20 and 21 are overcome for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that amended Claims 20 and 21 are clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in any combination.

Claims 3-5, 11, 13, and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagiwara in view of Zerphy, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,082,398 to Apple et al.

("Apple"). However, Claims 3-5, 11, 13, and 15-16 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 3-5, 11, 13, and 15-16 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, the cited references do not teach features such as dynamically defining at a client, selecting performed by a server or client, image to be displayed on a graphical user interface, generating the image in a server coupled to each display, segmenting performed in a server or plurality of servers. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent Claims 3-5, 11, 13, and 15-16 also be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagiwara in view of Zerphy, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0093894 to Tretter et al. ("Tretter"). However, Claim 9 depends from and further limits Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 9 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, the cited references do not teach wherein the first offset is not equal to the vertical offset and the second offset is equal to the horizontal offset for at least one of the plurality of display devices. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent Claim 9 also be withdrawn.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Apple in view of Zerphy. Applicant contends that the rejection of Claim 19 is overcome for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 is overcome. These reasons include Zerphy not disclosing, teaching, or suggesting the limitation of "image segments." Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 19 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in any combination.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1 and 3-21.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: June 12, 2008

/Gregory W. Carr/
Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093

CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003